

Exhibit 3

103

1 the world of kidneys, and it went to someone
 2 who was compatible for the wife's kidney? A.
 3 That's a fair way to put it.

4 Q. Do you know who ultimately received the
 5 Rabbi's wife's kidney?

6 A. That's a difficult question for me to parse
 7 because this individual that you're asking me
 8 about, I know some demographic information
 9 about her only because that individual's direct
 10 donor, which is, as you put it, the Rabbi's wife,
 11 the Rabbi's wife and she have a relationship in
 12 the sense that I have one with my direct
 13 recipient, the Rabbi. But I have never had
 14 contact with that individual, except that I wrote
 15 my letter to that individual, but I never received
 16 a reply.

17 And so I hope you understand that I'm
 18 giving you all this context because I have
 19 knowledge of her, but it's not direct knowledge.

20 Does that make sense?

21 Q. A little bit.

22 So the Rabbi's wife's kidney went to an
 23 individual who you don't know exactly who it is,
 24 but your letter that starts "Dear Recipient"

105

A. Yes. As I understand it, the part of the
 1 question the way you phrased it the first time,
 2 you said the Rabbi's wife went to the person,
 3 that's not how the process works.

4 Q. If I did, I misspoke. I'm sorry about that.

5 Who is Debbie Striks?

6 A. It's pronounced "stricts," and she's the
 7 Rabbi's wife in the way we have been referring to
 8 my recipient and his family.

9 Q. On the day that you wrote your July 2015
 10 letter, you obviously knew who the recipient was.
 11 It was the Rabbi. And on the day that you wrote
 12 your July 2015 letter, you knew that his wife
 13 Debbie Striks, donated a kidney to someone else,
 14 but you don't know who actually received Debbie
 15 Striks' kidney, is that right?

16 MS. ELOVECKY: Objection.

17 You can answer.

18 A. That was three parts. And so now I'm
 19 forgetting the first part.

20 Would you be able to simplify it?

21 Q. I'm just trying to go from the chain of kidneys
 22 here.